## Case 1:15-cv-01545-RJS Document 40 Filed 04/26/16 Page 1 of 22

G4CAAABBC Conference UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 HASSAN A. ABBAS, ESQ., Plaintiff, 4 5 15 CV 1545 (RJS) v. ORRICK, HERRINGTON SUTCLIFFE, 6 LLP and RICHARD A. MARTIN, 7 ESQ., 8 Defendants. 9 New York, N.Y. April 12, 2016 10 8:50 a.m. 11 Before: 12 HON. RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, 13 District Judge 14 APPEARANCES 15 HASSAN ABBAS, ESQ., PRO SE 16 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP 17 Attorneys for Defendants BY: KATHERINE L. MACO 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1 (Case called) 2 THE COURT: Have a seat. Thank you. 3 All right. It is now 9:15. We scheduled this, or 4 moved this conference to nine o'clock because I unfortunately 5 have a funeral to go to. So Mr. Abbas called and said he's 6 running late, that the weather and traffic have conspired to 7 keep him from here but it's getting tricky now. So let me just hear from counsel. 8 9 MR. ABBAS: Good morning, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: OK. Mr. Abbas, come on in. 11 MR. ABBAS: I apologize for the delay. I was stuck in traffic. 12 13 THE COURT: OK. Come to the front table. 14 Let's take appearances for plaintiff representing 15 himself. Would you state your name for the record for the 16 court reporter. 17 My name is Hassan Abbas. MR. ABBAS: THE COURT: OK. Good morning. And for the defendant? 18 19 MS. MACO: Morning, your Honor. 20 Katherine Maco, from Orrick Herrington, on behalf of 21 the defendants. 22 THE COURT: All right. Good morning. OK. We're here in connection with the order and 23

directing Mr. Abbas to make a submission and to appear as to

opinion that I issued back on, I quess it was March 16

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

why he shouldn't be sanctioned and why there shouldn't be a filing injunction against him based on what I deem to be a frivolous suit and given the Second Circuit's conclusion that there had been a history and a pattern of filing frivolous motions in the related action that went up on appeal. And so I now have a submission from Mr. Abbas.

I didn't make the defendants respond, so have you seen Mr. Abbas' submission?

MS. MACO: We have.

THE COURT: Is there anything you'd like to say in response?

MS. MACO: Your Honor, the only thing that I'll note is that it seems to be just another instance of Mr. Abbas failing to actually respond to the issue that is the heart of your Honor's request. It seems to be his mission is more related to rearguing the merits of Mr. Abbas' tortious interference claim that your Honor decided and not in fact responsive to your Honor's request to show cause why sanctions in this case should not be issued.

And I think to the extent that there's reargument, I think it's not responsive and shouldn't be considered and I think that is --

THE COURT: Well, with respect to the merits, again, I think I was very clear in my ruling. There is one e-mail which was then I guess compounded with a series of CC and forwarded

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

e-mails by Mr. Abbas but there's really one e-mail by defendants to the law firm. And for the reasons set forth in my opinion, I'm not revisiting that. The issue really with respect to the sanctions motion is what is it going to take to prevent future and further frivolous motions? That's really the issue.

And so let me ask you, Ms. Maco, are you concerned or worried that there is going to be more after this?

MS. MACO: We are, your Honor. And in fact I'll just note a couple things that have happened since the filings in this related to motions to dismiss. Two particular things, one of which your Honor may not be aware of. At the same time that Mr. Abbas filed a tortious interference action he also filed another case in the New York state courts and since --

> THE COURT: Against whom?

MS. MACO: Against KBC. And it was styled as a motion for summary judgment in lieu of complaint that sought payment of the two bank checks that were at issue in the original of these actions before your Honor. And since the time of the underlying briefing in this case in early February that matter came to a conclusion when we had our hearing before the Justice Braun, New York state Supreme Court. And he read an order onto the record in which he dismissed the action. And he also issued a warning to Mr. Abbas and Midamines as well, that plaintiff should be mindful of the fact that they've already

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

been warned in federal court and could take this a notice of the possibility that if another meritless case with merit claims request are asserted in another action or any further motion, the plaintiff could be subjected to sanctions.

And I have that form order for the Court if the Court would like to receive a copy.

THE COURT: Sure. You can hand it up. It's a public document, so no problem in handing up a copy.

You've seen this, Mr. Abbas, I assume?

I'm seeing this for the first time. MR. ABBAS:

THE COURT: This is a case in which you are a party.

MR. ABBAS: Yes, but this document is the first time I've seen it, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, you are not getting court documents in a case in which you are the plaintiff?

> Well, I'm --MR. ABBAS:

THE COURT: This is from February? This is part of my worry, Mr. Abbas, is that you are litigating remotely, not following dockets, just sort of tossing in motions and actions that have no clear thought and no merit. You're causing other people to incur a lot of expenses. You are causing courts to waste a lot of time and it's all because, frankly, you don't much care about that or maybe that's your purpose. But in the mean time you are just sort of doing your thing some place You've now had three courts threaten to sanction you for else.

your conduct. Do you think that we've all just got it wrong and you are just a hapless victim of a misunderstanding? You are you not seeing a pattern emerging here that three courts have considered what you are filing to be meritless?

MR. ABBAS: If I may respond, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, you may respond. Could you move the microphone closer to you.

MR. ABBAS: Your Honor, there's a lot of issues in your question and in some of the issues that Ms. Maco brought up. I felt this was a Rule 11 hearing with respect to the complaint, the tortious interference but I will go back to the beginning.

THE COURT: Well, it is that. And so the question is what is it going to take to deter you from filing frivolous motions and actions? And so Ms. Maco now brings to my attention an action that you brought in the state which is just a rehash, it seems to me on my brief review, of the prior action here in federal court. And the state judge has reached the same conclusion that the Second Circuit did and that I now have or at least that I warned which is that this is frivolous. So, what's going on?

MR. ABBAS: No, Judge Braun in the state court did not say that it was frivolous. Judge Braun simply ruled that the forum clause applied and that it should be transferred to Belgium and they had specifically requested sanctions for

filing frivolous claims. But Judge Brown said it was well argued and we presented the UCC argument and we presented the law on bank checks which supported the payments on the checks and --

THE COURT: Well, this is the judge said in that case.

In this case the numerous duplicative, senseless, confusing and sometimes illogical motions interposed by the petitioners warrant a finding that the conduct engaged in by petitioners was undertaken primarily to delay the resolution of the underlying action and to harass and/or maliciously injure the respondents herein.

That's a quote from Hershowitz. She's basically saying that's what went on in your case, right?

MR. ABBAS: Your Honor, you know I was at the hearing when Judge Braun made the decision on the forum clause issue and on the summary judgment issue in lieu of complaint which applies to bank checks and to monetary instruments. The case here that was filed here was on a negotiable instrument, monetary instrument which I received a payment for my fees and I filed a pro se action. At the beginning of the case I was representing myself and I was representing pro hac vice Midamines SPR Limited which is the Illinois Corp. And Handler Thayer that was in 2012. Steven Thayer and Thomas Handler had nothing to do with the case. I became counselor with Tom Handler and Steve Thayer in 2014. And therefore, when the

| G4CAAADDC

sanctions order came from the Second Circuit on that motion to disqualify, OK, it addressed the appellant which was myself and Midamines SPR Limited which is an Illinois Corp and I didn't fully understand why the Illinois Corp was being sanctioned and I wasn't aware of the actual sanction standard in that order of the Second Circuit. It just said vexatious, frivolous and you have to pay reasonable attorney's fees.

Now there was no obligation on Steve Thayer or Thomas Handler to pay any fees. They misused that order of the Second Circuit which never authorized them to contact my colleagues in Illinois and threaten them. You referred to one e-mail. But that one e-mail, your Honor, was the kiss of death for my relationship with Tom Handler and Steve Thayer because as soon as they received that e-mail, the next day my relationship with them was terminated and my bio on the website was taken off. And I established because we had a --

THE COURT: You are sort of rearguing the merits of this. You don't intend to answer the question, right? So, do you intend to file more actions and more motions in this or any of the related cases that have been filed to date, yes or no? Do you intend to sort of keep this going?

MR. ABBAS: Your Honor, my intention is simply to get my checks paid and to recover my money. I don't think I'm being frivolous or meritless in trying to recoup money that KBC has held since 2012. No, your Honor, this money has been

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sitting in New York --

THE COURT: There was an arbitration that was supposed to cover that, right?

MR. ABBAS: No, your Honor, there was no arbitration. There were initially two banks, your Honor, if I can explain the background please. First, there was an account in a bank.

THE COURT: Again, I think you're arguing -- you are trying to reargue the merits of things and I'm just trying to figure out what is the likelihood of continued vexatious litigation, which I'm not the first person to say that. That's what the Second Circuit characterized your litigation tactics as and that's what the judge in New York state who is Judge Braun said at end of his decision.

Plaintiff should be mindful of the fact they've already been warned in federal court and should take this as notice of the possibility that if another meritless case with meritless claims which rise to the level of frivolity are asserted in another action or in another further motion, the plaintiffs could be subjected to sanctions at that point. that's the judge finding a meritless case with meritless claims.

MR. ABBAS: Well, your Honor, I understand that this Court and the Second Circuit and the state court said that the claim was frivolous or meritless. I respectfully disagree with that, your Honor. With all due deference to the Court because

my money has been here in New York for four years and they don't have any right to keep that money or to possess that money. Now we're going to file, you're asking about future litigation.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ABBAS: My intention was to file it in Belgium now. Your Honor said it should be filed in Belgium although the forum clause itself didn't specify Belgium. It specified particular province in a particular bank. There was no banking relationship with KBC. We have no contract with KBC. We have no bank account with KBC.

THE COURT: So I got it wrong. The circuit got it wrong. Are you rearguing that?

MR. ABBAS: No.

THE COURT: You are just rearguing these things over and over. It's sort of like dealing with a child.

MR. ABBAS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: No, it is because I have children, so I understand how it works. But none of that changes anything, OK? I ruled. The Circuit affirmed. The Circuit sanctioned you for frivolous and vexatious motions. They sent it to me to determine what that amount would be. You then turn around and come back with a new action against the lawyers designed, as I've already found, really just to stick it to them, just to make life difficult and so I've already ruled on merits of

that. I do think it was meritless. I think it was designed just to antagonize an adversary who beat you in the district court and the circuit and I don't think there is any good faith basis for making the claims that you've made. So I've ruled on that. The real issue is, are you going to keep doing this?

And I think the answer is "yes". I think you said, yes, you do intend to do this.

MR. ABBAS: No. I said, you Honor, that you transferred the case to Belgium and that we are going to pursue --

THE COURT: So why did you go to New York state court?

MR. ABBAS: Well, the state court because I had the -there was a law which allowed accelerated payment of checks
rather than going and spinning our wheels for four years in a
Belgium court.

THE COURT: It was better to spin Justice Braun's wheels in a case which he characterizes as meritless and with meritless claims?

MR. ABBAS: He didn't say that, I don't think so.

THE COURT: He didn't say that? I've just quoted it had.

MR. ABBAS: At least not to me personally when I was in court with him. He said Mr. Abbas did not file frivolous motions in this court.

THE COURT: This is the transcript. Maybe it's been

doctored. Are you accusing them of doctoring this? It says that you were there. This is the date I'm looking at February 5. The proceedings are transcribed. And in it I quoted the language from this case which was Hershowitz v. Thompkins which the Court quoted. And it's not set out in quotation, so the transcript is a little confusing but that's at page ten. And then on page 12 the judge makes it clear that he is not going to sanction you at that time but he puts you on notice that if another meritless case with meritless claims is asserted in another action or in any further motion plaintiff could be subjected to sanctions. So, clearly Justice Braun was no more impressed with the arguments than I or the Second Circuit have been. So, why were you in state court?

MR. ABBAS: As I explained, your Honor, there's a law for accelerated judgment of payment of monetary instruments. So, it's a summary judgment motion in lieu of complaint. We filed one motion and they filed their response about the forum clause and the judge ruled that the forum clause applied and that was the end of the matter. He didn't look at the UCC violations of New York because if you recall, your Honor —

THE COURT: Right. That made it a meritless claim.

MR. ABBAS: Your Honor, I mean I understand that this word "meritless" and "vexatious" has been used in all these documents but the fact remains, your Honor, that they are holding money that does not belong to them and I received those

checks. Those checks are still not paid. So it's not frivolous when somebody is looking to recover their fees.

THE COURT: It's frivolous when you go to the wrong court. It's frivolous when you attempt to short circuit the procedures that were already agreed to or already set forth under the law or in a court's opinion which has been affirmed. So that's the problem. You have a tendency to sort of want to do things your way. So are you contemplating any further actions in United States regarding these checks?

MR. ABBAS: No, your Honor. I'm contemplating to start the case in Belgium for payment of the bank checks.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's stop there.

Ms. Maco, so one of the things I'm supposed to consider is the likelihood of continued filings. And so Mr. Abbas has said that he's not intending to file any more actions in the United States. Do you not believe him?

MS. MACO: Well, your Honor, up to that point — since the time that your Honor issued the March 16 order that brings us here today, the Court was considering and likely to issue sanctions. Mr. Abbas has filed additional filings on motions for reconsideration of the Court's ruling that the fees were reasonable which was denied and has appealed both that order and the order in this case to the Second Circuit.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure that a filing injunction and sanctions can prevent somebody from appealing.

I think he's got a right to appeal. But are you concerned that there will be other actions regardless of how that appeal goes that will have you popping up in courtrooms all over the country?

MS. MACO: Yes, your Honor. Certainly, he has a right to appeal but he seems to have no intent to stop litigating these matters. It seems to just be a continuous campaign of litigation here and I have absolutely no reason to think that he wouldn't file actions elsewhere.

THE COURT: He is talking about filing an action in Belgium.

MS. MACO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You are not objecting to that or are you?

MS. MACO: No, your Honor. As we've argued in underlying Midamines action we think that Belgium is the appropriate place. We think this claim is meritless but if he brings it in the appropriate forum we'll obviously address it. We have no reason to think that he won't continue to file additional actions under other index numbers, perhaps, in this court, go to other jurisdictions.

THE COURT: He just said that he is not going to do that. You don't believe him?

MS. MACO: Respectfully, your Honor, we have no reason to think that he will stop his campaign.

THE COURT: And then one of the considerations or

monetary sanctions as a deterrent and the calculation of monetary sanctions can include or at least requires consideration of what counsels spend so far. Now that's the not the only consideration but it is a consideration. So how much has your firm spent so far in litigating this action?

MS. MACO: In this particular action, I don't have those figures at my disposal at the moment but I'm certainly willing to make a submission and indicate how much we've spent on this action to date.

THE COURT: OK. One of the points that Mr. Abbas has made is that he doesn't have the wherewithal to pay sanctions which is a consideration. So what's your response to that?

MS. MACO: Well, my response to that is that I think that Mr. Abbas' representations that he doesn't have the ability to pay should not necessarily make him immune from potential sanctions that might be at issue. Otherwise, he may have no --

THE COURT: Well, a filing sanction will prevent an indigent litigate from just clogging the courts and wasting everyone's time. That's what it's there for. Monetary sanctions are designed to effectively deter the same kind of conduct and they're not likely to be useful against somebody who's indigent. And so do you have any knowledge or any reason to doubt the state of Mr. Abbas' financial affairs.

MS. MACO: We have no insight into Mr. Abbas'

financial affairs. I know that he seems to be pursuing litigation here, although, he lives abroad and coming back and forth for court hearings and such. So I have no specific information about his financial situation. I would say that I think that leave to file sanctions are of foremost concern or foremost priority for us. This campaign has just go on far too long and I think it's time to be stopped.

THE COURT: OK. Mr. Abbas, tell me about the state of your finances. You have claimed that you don't have the ability to even pay the sanctions that were ordered by the Second Circuit and I made the finding of the dollar amount but they're the ones who contemplated that you should have to pay it. So what does it say to your finances right now?

MR. ABBAS: Well, your Honor, I don't have the money. You ordered me to pay 70,000. That's impossible. I don't have that kind of money at all. And I would like to respond to a few of the points that were raised.

THE COURT: I think you are going to need to more than just say, "I don't have the money". I think you are probably going to have to submit a declaration and indicate what sort of assets you do have because you're the one who is asserting that you're unable to pay any sanctions.

MR. ABBAS: Yeah, your Honor, that is right.

THE COURT: You are flying back and forth between continents litigating in multiple form.

MR. ABBAS: Well, your Honor, thank good for my mother because she is helping me out and that's truth. I have to borrow money from her to come here. And the fact is that in Beirut we have a house. I'm with my mom and dad and we have --so, as I explained to your Honor I continue in my legal education in Beirut. I registered at university there and it's a Lebanese university. I'm taking law courses in Arabic and trying to register for the Beirut bar. So the financial aspect, honestly, your Honor, I don't have the money. I can't pay it.

And I also appealed it because I feel it is unreasonable, your Honor, because they overstaffed the motion. I'm one lawyer. I prepared that motion to disqualify. They could have had one lawyer prepare the response. They didn't need five lawyers conferencing with each other for I don't know how much it was exactly. So I think it was overbilled and over litigate and that is why I appealed the decision, your Honor.

And with respect to this Rule 11, you are talking about the deterrence factors, the Rule 11 as you said is to deter frivolous litigation, not to impose monetary sanctions that are --

THE COURT: Right. I just said that.

MR. ABBAS: And I think with the element of cause of action if we go to the tortious interference element --

THE COURT: This is rearguing the merits again, so.

MR. ABBAS: But I just want to say, your Honor, I know you disagree with me with some the elements you know but I alleged the elements. I alleged there was a relationship that was interfered with.

THE COURT: You don't have to allege. You have to plausibly allege.

MR. ABBAS: And plausibly, of course, no one likes to be sued. When Tom Handler and no one like to be threatened with law suit. When Tom Handler received and e-mail saying that Mr. Abbas doesn't pay, we are going to look to you to pay, the follow-up e-mail says when I asked, please, don't send any more e-mails. He said, no, I will decide how to collect. So he wanted to collect against Tom and Steve. So, of course, when they heard those things they didn't want to be financially responsible for sanctions or for having problems with the lawsuit. Of course they decided to terminate the relationship. So that's why I understand you disagreed and you said --

THE COURT: I've ruled on this. OK?

MR. ABBAS: But I just want to say, your Honor, that I pleaded all the elements of the cause of action and they were supported by facts. I even mentioned a church v. Liberty case which has the four elements.

THE COURT: There is no question of what the elements are. The issue is on the facts that you allege could a reasonable fact finder conclude that you had a cause of action

here? And the answer I felt was resoundingly "no". I've ruled and so you can appeal that. I don't think a filing sanction can prevent you from appealing. No one's arguing otherwise.

But I don't think there's any point in rearguing the motion now when I've ruled on the motion.

We're here for a different purpose and that is, what is it going to take to stop you from filing frivolous lawsuits and frivolous motions? Frivolous motions that the Second Circuit found to be vexatious and that an action that although the State Supreme Court didn't sanction you, put you on notice that continued actions of that kind were going to resolve, potentially result in sanctions? So I don't think the message is getting through.

MR. ABBAS: Your Honor, I understand you ruled on it. It was a 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss. My only point is that even though the 12(b)(6) motion was granted doesn't necessarily mean sanctions are appropriate is what my point is, your Honor.

And I want to say with respect to this Belgium
litigation, she says I have no idea, she's speculating he might
file cases all over the United States in every single district
court. A few weeks ago when I was in Belgium or a month ago I
sent to Ms. Maco a request because there's a financial
ombudsman in Belgium that assists parties in dealing with banks

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. ABBAS: So I wrote a letter to the ombudsman to

see if this matter could be settled that KBC has been holding money in New York for four years and in Brussels for four years that doesn't belong to hem. So I asked the ombudsman to intervene and I asked Ms. Maco, can you please let me know who are the attorneys for the KBC in Brussels that I can communicate with. She never answered me. No response, whatsoever.

So KBC did not want to proceed with any potential resolution of the case in Belgium. So that's why I'm contemplating to start the case there not in the United States. I got the message from your Honor and from the state court that they don't want to hear that claim on checks that it should be in Belgium.

THE COURT: But the Second Circuit weighed in on this too.

MR. ABBAS: On the Second Circuit, your Honor, with the motion to disqualify -- I just want to clarify one point, your Honor. I was trying to alert the Second Circuit about an e-mail that I received. They say it was inadvertent. I don't know if it was or not but they said it was inadvertent where Mr -- so I filed a motion to disqualify to alert the court that this is it.

THE COURT: The Second Circuit affirmed my ruling with respect to the checks, right?

MR. ABBAS: The Second Circuit affirmed the ruling

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with respect to the forum clause. You never decided on the merits of the checks.

THE COURT: No, no. Of course, I didn't decide on the merits of the checks.

MR. ABBAS: It was just a procedural question.

THE COURT: The point is, it was appeal to the Second Circuit. It was affirmed. In the course of that appeal you made motions that the Second Circuit found to be frivolous and vexatious and they ordered you to pay the costs associated with that.

So anyway we're kind of just rehashing here. I would like I quess submissions from Mr. Abbas as to his financial circumstances and his ability to pay the sanction, the monetary sanction.

and I would like a statement of what has been spent by the defendants here in litigating this action, not the other stuff, just this action. That I think is relevant to a determination as to whether monetary sanctions are appropriate.

With respect to filing sanctions, I'm going to reserve on that and decide whether it's appropriate in light of what was said here today. OK?

All right. Thank you. Anything else we should cover? Let's have those within two weeks. OK? I'd like those So you have a declaration of your financial submissions. circumstances and the same two weeks for defendants to make a

declaration with exhibits if necessary about what has been spent on this case.

If some portion of this is something that should be filed under seal you can make that request. There's a presumption of open records but that presumption can be overcome where it involves financial privacy and things like that. So if you wish to make a filing under seal or redacted, in a redacted form just make that request, citing to the relevant case law. The key case is I guess the Lugosch case, L-U-G-O-S-C-H, OK?

So two weeks from today puts us at April 26, OK? So the 26th of April, is that all right?

You can do that, Mr. Abbas?

MR. ABBAS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. All right. So if anyone needs a copy of this transcript they can take that up with the court reporter. I have to run now, but thanks. Have a good day.

(Adjourned)